

## **OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

**APPLICATION NO:** P0457.22

**WARD :** Cranham **Date Received:** 21st March 2022

**ADDRESS:** 86 Deyncourt Gardens  
Upminster

**PROPOSAL:** Single storey rear extension for use as conservatory and relocation of existing patio steps into the garden (Part retrospective).

**DRAWING NO(S):** Site Location Plan; S57-1; S57-2; S57-4; S57-5; S57-6; S57-7.

**RECOMMENDATION :** It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

---

### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application property consists of a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The surrounding area is characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings. The ground slopes downwards from the dwelling towards the rear garden.

#### **Note:**

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos were provided by the applicant/agent in support of the application as well as from the enforcement record. In determining this planning application photos, Google StreetView TM, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**

The scheme proposes the construction of a single storey rear extension on an existing raised patio with a pitched roof (Part retrospective).

It is noted this is has a result of an enforcement case ref:ENF/319/19.

### **RELEVANT HISTORY**

- P0472.22 - REAR GARDEN DECKING  
Awaiting Decision
- D0310.19 - Certificate of Lawfulness for a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and 4No. front roof light windows.  
PP not required 17-10-2019
- P1164.19 - Proposed part two storey/part single storey side and rear extensions with steps to rear garden and front extension.  
Apprv with cons 29-10-2019

### **CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS**

#### **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Letters were sent to neighbouring owner/occupiers. Two letters of objection were received with their comments summarised below:

- Loss of light

- Loss of privacy
- Proposal would dominate the back garden
- Issues of noise, structural damage and disruption

Officers response:

- Matters relating to noise, structural damage and disruption are not material planning consideration for this type of planning application and cannot affect the determination of this application.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES**

NPPF (2021)

London Plan (2021)

Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth

Policy D3 - Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach.

Policy D4 - Delivering good design

Havering Local Plan (2016 - 2031)

Policy 7 Residential design and amenity

Policy 24 Parking provision and design

Policy 26 Urban design

## **MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS**

This application is not CIL liable.

## **DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE**

Regarding single storey rear extensions, the SPD advises that semi-detached houses can be extended from their rear walls by up to 4m, and should not exceed 3m in height if a flat roof is proposed. Guidelines go on to suggest that if a greater depth is required it should be within an angle of 45 degrees, taken from the 4m dimension on the property boundary.

The guidance is reinforced by policy 7 (residential design and amenity) of the local plan, which seeks to ensure any development would be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact upon the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

It is noted that the application site already benefits from a part two/part single storey rear extension. The approved single storey rear extension was 3.5m in depth and 4.37m in height. This application proposes an additional 2m depth with a height of 4.14m from natural ground level and steps leading into the garden.

The site falls within the Zone B of the Hall Lane Policy Area which is typified by relatively large semi-detached and detached dwellings set in generous well landscaped gardens with good tree cover. The Hall Lane Policy Area SPD outlines where planning permission is needed for the improvement or extension of existing houses, if the new work is complementary to the existing dwelling and a useful building is to be given a further lease of life, the application will be considered sympathetically.

Officer have given consideration to the overall depth of the proposed extension. It is noted that the host dwelling benefits from a sizeable rear garden, meaning that the extension would not dominate its rear garden scene. It would therefore provide a sufficient degree of subservience to the house and would integrate appropriately with the character of the rear garden environment.

Therefore the proposal is judged to not adversely affect the character of the property or the

visual amenities of the rear garden scene, on balance therefore, its impact on the rear garden environment is considered acceptable.

## **IMPACT ON AMENITY**

The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document states that single storey extensions to a semi-detached property should not exceed 4m in depth and 3m in height unless special circumstances exist.

No. 84 Deyncourt Gardens:

The proposal would have no impact on the amenity of the dwelling to the west as it would be screened from it by the existing development.

No. 88 Deyncourt Gardens:

Given the extension to this neighbour, the proposal would project approximately 2m beyond the rear of this neighbouring dwelling, less than the 4m usually permissible where a semi-detached neighbour has not previously extended. As such, it is considered that any impact of the depth and height of the proposal on this neighbour would be within reasonable tolerances in terms of loss of light, privacy and outlook, because the extension of this neighbour is considered to mitigate the impacts of the proposal on its occupants. Orientation is also important, the rear garden is south facing, as such it is not envisaged to result in loss of light. Submitted plans show steps from the extension into the rear garden area. The proposal does not include a raised patio that could result in overlooking. The proposed height at 4.14m exceeds the policy guideline - given the natural drop in ground level which appears to be common for properties along this side of Deyncourt Gardens - whereby ground level slopes down to the South substantially, it is officers view that this abates any potential adverse impact in terms of outlook.

Given the above circumstances and mindful of the general presumption in favour of development, it is considered any impact upon the adjacent neighbours to be modest and within that envisaged as acceptable within guidelines.

## **HIGHWAY/PARKING**

The proposal does not seek to change the existing car parking arrangement on the site, as such the development would not likely result in adverse impacts on parking or highway issues.

## **KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS**

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the above-mentioned policies and guidance and approval is recommended.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

### **1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs**

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

### **2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)**

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out as approved.

**3. SC10 (Matching materials)**

All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area.

---

**INFORMATIVES**

**1 Approval - No negotiation required**

Statement Required by Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

---

|                                              |
|----------------------------------------------|
| <b>Authorising Officer:</b> Raphael Adenegan |
|----------------------------------------------|

|            |
|------------|
| 16-05-2022 |
|------------|